

ENTERED

August 22, 2025

Nathan Ochsner, Clerk

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
HOUSTON DIVISION**HALLIBURTON ENERGY SERVICES, INC., §
Plaintiff, §

v. §

GRANT PRIDECO, INC., REEDHYCALOG §
UK, LTD., REEDHYCALOG, LP, §
NATIONAL OILWELL VARCO, LP, §
Defendants. §CIVIL ACTION NO. 4:23-CV-01789
FILED UNDER SEAL**ORDER**

Before the Court is Halliburton's Motion for Clarification of this Court's Order on NOV's Motion for Partial Summary Judgment. (Doc. No. 215). In this motion, Halliburton seeks clarification that the Court did not decide as a matter of law or fact that "a Deep Leached Cutter (in a Licensed Halliburton Drill Bit or alone) as defined in the Patent License practices any claims of any of the 12 Core Patents" nor did the Court decide that "none of the expired Licensed RH Patents are necessarily practiced by Deep Leached Cutters in a Licensed Halliburton Drill Bit or alone." (Doc. No. 217 at 1–2).

NOV responded in opposition to the motion for clarification on the ground that NOV does not think there is any lack of clarity, nor does it read this Court's order contrary to Halliburton's understanding. (Doc. No. 242 at 2). Nevertheless, to avoid "additional disputes parsing the new language" NOV argues that the Court should still deny Halliburton's motion for clarification. (*Id.*).

Both parties contend that this motion was relevant to the arguments made in their briefing on the application of *Brulotte*. That briefing is now complete, and the Court does not find that clarification was needed for the parties to argue their positions sufficiently and persuasively. Further, both Halliburton and NOV seem to agree that the Court's prior summary judgment order

did *not* find as a matter of law or fact that Licensed Halliburton Drill Bits do (or do not) practice any particular subset of the 12 Core Patents. As this consensus reading of the prior order aligns with the Court's intent, the Court finds this motion to be effectively moot. Thus, the motion for clarification is **DENIED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Signed this 20th day of August, 2025.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'A. Hanen', written over a horizontal line.

Andrew S. Hanen
United States District Judge